

Leanne McRae regarding a Team for policy definition

A few tidbits from the staff meeting:

- They talked about conflict - and even about many of them not facing it very often.
- They did exercises that had them talking about emotions/feelings.
- I asked about JR - got no good answer, this particular worker wasn't even aware of the Deut scripture being used. I vocalized how hard it is to see so many of them "doing nothing and saying nothing" when they have a perpetrator on staff. The optics of it. The "what side of history do you want to be on?" side of it. The "if you won't stand up about a CSA perpetrator on your staff, what's the point in doing a workshop about CSA perpetrators?" side.
- I also mentioned how hard it is for many of us to feel positive about this staff meeting, when we've been asking for 6 months for *something*. That actions speak louder than words and that JR on staff speaks way louder than a "positive staff meeting" that has helped educate some a bit more.
- There is, apparently, still a vast gap between where all the workers are. Some still feel "we only need God", and some feel that changes need to be made.

- @Christine - as I lay awake last night - a few things that would be good to find out...
 - What is the mandate/goals of this team?
 - Are there any professionals on the team or will professionals be involved?
 - If a plan / protocol / code is created - who has the final say on it being implemented? If it's "senior management", then are you putting time and energy into something that will be never be implemented?
 - Are there team members from a variety of sectors - workers, elders & their wives, young couples with families? I feel we need the full spectrum involved as each brings different views/ideas to the table.
 - Will this encompass a standard for dealing with perpetrators? Zero tolerance?

Perhaps a post could be started under Content for keeping questions and updates together?